

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

MAY 19, 1896.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PRITCHARD, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted the following

REPORT:

[To accompany H. R. 5225.]

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5225) for the relief of Elizabeth M. Williams, have examined the same and report:

The report of the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House of Representatives, hereto appended, is adopted, and the passage of the bill is recommended.

HOUSE REPORT.

The claimant is the widow of William Williams, who served as a private in Captain Wear's Company of Tennessee Volunteers in the Florida Indian war of 1836. The records show that he was paid for twenty-five and one-half days' service, and it also appears that he was a pensioner during his lifetime at \$4 per month under certificate No. 7477, on account of a gunshot wound of left leg received in said service. After the soldier's death, which occurred November 10, 1876, his widow, the claimant, made an application for pension under the general law, alleging that his death was due to causes originating in the service, but, owing to the long time which had elapsed since the war, she was unable to furnish the necessary proof in support of her claim.

On September 3, 1892, she filed a claim under the Indian war service-pension act of July 27, 1892, but the same was rejected by the Pension Bureau on the ground that the service, as shown by the records, lacked four and one-half days of the period required by the said act to give title.

It appears from the papers on file at the Pension Bureau that the claimant married the soldier in 1845, and it is shown by the affidavits of S. Y. Minnis and J. H. Kelso, sr., residents of Monroe County, Tenn., that she is about 75 years years old, in very feeble health, and dependent upon her children for support.

It may be added that the records of the Treasury Department show that the soldier's enrollment took place June 30, 1836, and his discharge July 31, 1836, a period of thirty-two days, but as other records show payment for twenty-five and one-half days only it was held that the claim did not come within the scope of the service act.

The passage of the bill is respectfully recommended.